



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

11-2

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/763,845	02/27/2001	Christoph Herrmann	PHD 99,088	5206
24737	7590	02/20/2008		
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			EXAMINER AHN, SAM.K	
			ART UNIT 2611	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 02/20/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/763,845	HERRMANN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sam K. Ahn	2611	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 December 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 14-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 14-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04/01/05 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 12/06/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants have amended each of the independent claims and asserts that Take and Kanterakis fails to teach the amended limitations by pointing out that figure 5 of Take fails to meet the amended limitations. The Examiner disagrees. Take teaches a wireless network (see wireless communication in Fig.3) comprising a base station (one of 2a-2c in Fig.3) in communication with a plurality of terminals (1a-1e in Fig.3); at least one terminal of the plurality of terminals (one of 1a-1e in Fig.3) operable to be assigned to a radio cell of the base station for exchanging user data and control data (wherein one skilled in the art would recognize that connection between base stations and mobile stations as illustrated in figure 13 requires user data and control data), the terminal further operable to transmit a wish by the terminal to use one of the plurality of contention channels (RACH use Request, 0208 in Fig.7); wherein the base station upon receiving the wish for the service is operable to broadcast a provision message (RACH Channel Notification 0209 in Fig.7, wherein the channel information of Unassigned State represents the channel state of the RACH by a message, note col.10, lines 52-63) indicating a channel that is available to the plurality of terminals for contention-based access (the RACH channel is available to Mobile stations A and B in Fig.8 wherein the RACH channel is contention based access by the two Mobile stations).

Although Take teaches the terminal requesting for service by transmitting a signal, does not explicitly teach transmitting a first signaling sequence.

Kanterakis also teaches a terminal communicating with a base station (see Fig.1) wherein the terminal (further shown in Fig.3) transmits signals by multiplying (326) with a spreading sequence generator (327), hence signals transmitted by the terminal are pseudo random square wave signals (note col.4, lines 18-19).

Kanterakis further teaches the base station (see Fig.4) receiving the signals transmitted by the terminal and correlating (315, wherein one skilled in the art would recognize that matched filters perform the function of correlating) in order to produce pulses (output of 315). Hence, both Take and Kanterakis teach a CDMA system wherein Take implements RACH signaling, note US 6,549,564 supporting that RACH are implemented in CDMA systems, see Fig.3, and note c.4, l.47-54) comprising a base station and a terminal communicating with each other, wherein Kanterakis further teaches the detailed steps of spreading and despreading the signals, which are spread spectrum signals, note col.3, lines 64-67. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Kanterakis in the system of Take by transmitting and receiving signals in a spread spectrum manner, by including the spreading sequence generator in the transmitter of the mobile station and correlating in order to despread the signals for the purpose of combating against intruders from receiving the transmitted signals, which is well-known to one skilled in the art. Hence, the transmitted signals of Take would have the first signaling sequence by the output of

the terminal, and the received signals by the base station would incorporate the correlator for despreading. Therefore, Take in view of Kanterakis teach the claimed limitations.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 14-19 and 21-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Take et al. US 5,883,887 (Take) in view of Kanterakis US 6,389,056 B1 (cited previously).

Regarding claim 14, Take teaches a wireless network (see wireless communication in Fig.3) comprising a base station (one of 2a-2c in Fig.3) in communication with a plurality of terminals (1a-1e in Fig.3); at least one terminal of the plurality of terminals (one of 1a-1e in Fig.3) operable to be assigned to a radio cell of the base station for exchanging user data and control data (wherein one skilled in the art would recognize that connection between base stations and mobile stations as illustrated in figure 13 requires user data and control data), the terminal further operable to transmit a wish by the terminal to use one of the plurality of contention channels (RACH use Request, 0208 in Fig.7); wherein the base station upon receiving the wish for the service is operable to broadcast a

provision message (RACH Channel Notification 0209 in Fig.7, wherein the channel information of Unassigned State represents the channel state of the RACH by a message, note col.10, lines 52-63) indicating a channel that is available to the plurality of terminals for contention-based access (the RACH channel is available to Mobile stations A and B in Fig.8 wherein the RACH channel is contention based access by the two Mobile stations).

Although Take teaches the terminal requesting for service by transmitting a signal, does not explicitly teach transmitting a first signaling sequence.

Kanterakis also teaches a terminal communicating with a base station (see Fig.1) wherein the terminal (further shown in Fig.3) transmits signals by multiplying (326) with a spreading sequence generator (327), hence signals transmitted by the terminal are pseudo random square wave signals (note col.4, lines 18-19).

Kanterakis further teaches the base station (see Fig.4) receiving the signals transmitted by the terminal and correlating (315, wherein one skilled in the art would recognize that matched filters perform the function of correlating) in order to produce pulses (output of 315). Hence, both Take and Kanterakis teach a CDMA system wherein Take implements RACH signaling, note US 6,549,564 supporting that RACH are implemented in CDMA systems, see Fig.3, and note c.4, l.47-54) comprising a base station and a terminal communicating with each other, wherein Kanterakis further teaches the detailed steps of spreading and despread the signals, which are spread spectrum signals, note col.3, lines 64-67. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the

invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Kanterakis in the system of Take by transmitting and receiving signals in a spread spectrum manner, by including the spreading sequence generator in the transmitter of the mobile station and correlating in order to despread the signals for the purpose of combating against intruders from receiving the transmitted signals, which is well-known to one skilled in the art. Hence, the transmitted signals of Take would have the first signaling sequence by the output of the terminal, and the received signals by the base station would incorporate the correlator for despreading.

Regarding claim 15, Kanterakis further teaches a terminal provided for transmitting a signaling sequence during a certain time slot (note col.11, lines 40-57) of a transmitting-end reference frame, and after receiving a provision message (ACK signal) from the base station, for transmitting a terminal identification data packets over at least one contention channel. (note col.9, lines 31-45).

Regarding claim 16, Kanterakis further teaches correlating the received signal (by a matched filter, 315) to generate the pulse, and further detecting the peak evolved, (note col.6, lines 1-19) wherein the base station detects the power level of the signal to determine signaling sequence comprising pilot signals.

Regarding claim 17, Kanterakis further teaches a terminal provided for transmitting a Gold, Kasami or Golay sequence (col.8, lines 24-40) as a signaling sequence during a specific time slot of a transmitting-end reference frame. (note col.11, lines 40-57).

Regarding claim 18, Take further teaches wherein the terminal is further operable to transmit a second signaling sequence to the base station in response to a failure to receive an acknowledgement of the reception of the first signaling sequence by the base station within a predefined period of time after transmission of the first signaling sequence to the base station (see failure 0307 in Fig.8 and transmitting second signal 0310 within the time between transmitting 0305 and 0309)

Regarding claim 19, the claim is rejected as applied to claim 18 with similar scope.

Regarding claim 21, Kanterakis further teaches a terminal provided for transmitting or receiving a signaling sequence during one of various determined time slots (note col.11, lines 40-57) of a transmitting-end reference frame, and after receiving a provision message (ACK signal) from the base station, for transmitting a terminal identification data packets over at least one contention channel. (note col.9, lines 31-45) Furthermore, it is inherent that the terminal transmits the terminal identification only when the provision message indicates

the respective time slot. As previously explained, the provision message includes the time slot information and therefore, transmitting the terminal identification would only occur after the reception of the provision message.

Regarding claim 22, Kanterakis also teaches transmission of a signaling sequence transmitted by plurality of terminals communicating with a base station. (note col.1, lines 30-43) Furthermore, it is inherent that the signaling sequence transmitted by the terminal is part of a multiplicity of signaling sequence to be used in a radio cell, since there are more than one terminals communicating with the base station requesting for a contention channel each using a different signaling sequence.

Regarding claim 23, Kanterakis further teaches a terminal selecting a signaling sequence to request for one or a plurality of contention channel (see Fig.4, and note col.6, lines 25-35) and further, the data rates are different from the base station. (note col.9, lines 54-61 wherein the terminal informs the base station of the data rate, which may be different from the rate of base station. (note col.9, lines 54-61).

Regarding claim 24, the claim is rejected as applied to claim 14 with similar scope.

Regarding claim 25, the claim is rejected as applied to claim 16 with similar scope.

Regarding claim 26, the claim is rejected as applied to claim 14 with similar scope.

Regarding claim 27, the claim is rejected as applied to claim 15 with similar scope.

Regarding claim 28, the claim is rejected as applied to claim 17 with similar scope.

Regarding claim 29, the claim is rejected as applied to claim 18 with similar scope.

Regarding claim 30, the claim is rejected as applied to claim 18 with similar scope.

Regarding claim 31, the claim is rejected as applied to claim 20 with similar scope.

Regarding claim 32, the claim is rejected as applied to claim 21 with similar scope.

Regarding claim 33, the claim is rejected as applied to claim 14 with similar scope.

Regarding claim 34, Take further teaches wherein the terminal, upon receiving the provision message is further operable to transmit a registration request to the base station, and wherein the base station, upon receiving the registration

request, is further operable to acknowledge the reception of the registration request to the terminal and assign the terminal to the radio cell (upon receiving RACH1 – RACH3 assigns the terminal to be registered to the base station, see table in Fig.13 and note c.12, l.19-25).

Regarding claim 35, the claim is rejected as applied to claim 34 with similar scope.

Regarding claim 36, the claim is rejected as applied to claim 34 with similar scope.

Regarding claim 37, the claim is rejected as applied to claim 34 with similar scope.

Regarding claim 38, Take further teaches wherein the channel is available for contention-based access for a limited time period (the RACH channel is available for contention based access for the two Mobile Stations A and B for the limited time period of until the Unassigned State becomes Occupied State in Fig.8).

Regarding claim 39, the claim is rejected as applied to claim 38 with similar scope.

Regarding claim 40, the claim is rejected as applied to claim 38 with similar scope.

3. Claim 20 is are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Take et al. US 5,883,887 (Take) in view of Kanterakis US 6,389,056 B1 (cited previously) and Crichton et al. US 6,330,459 B1 (Crichton).

Regarding claim 20, the claim is rejected as applied to claim 18 with similar scope. However, Take in view of Kanterakis do not explicitly teach increasing power when initial transmission fails.

Crichton teaches increasing power (note col.5, line 47) when initial transmission fails. Crichton suggests that this ensures that the signaling is properly received by the base station (note c.5, l.35-54). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Crichton in the system of Take in view of Kanterakis of power up the power when initial transmission fails for the purpose of ensuring that the signaling is properly received by the base station (note c.5, l.35-54).

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory

period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sam Ahn whose telephone number is (571) 272-3044. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mohammad Ghayour can be reached on (571) 272-3021. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Sam K. Ahn
Primary Examiner

02/19/08